REMARKS

Applicants amend claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, and 22, and cancel claims 10 and 29-31 without prejudice. New claims 32-34 are added. As discussed in more detail below, support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the specification, e.g., pages 3-4 and 269-270. Thus, no new matter is added. The various grounds of rejection are discussed below.

Restriction of claims 29-31

Claims 29-31 have been canceled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C . § 112

The Office Action rejects claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. To overcome this rejection, this claim is amended to remove the recitation of "receiving a resource selection from a user through a user interface." Hence, withdrawal of the rejections of claim 8 and claims 9-10, which depend on claim 8, is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 11-25, and 28 as being anticipated by a Cisco Systems, Inc., reference entitled "Using Threshold Manager."

Claim 1 recites a method of managing a telecommunications network that comprises executing at least one application on a network device, receiving a threshold expression from a user through a user interface, and implementing the threshold expression within the network device while the network device is operational. Implementing the threshold expression comprises the steps of storing the threshold expression in a configuration database and establishing at least *one active query between the configuration database and the application so as to send a notification from the database to the application upon occurrence of a change in said threshold expression.*

Cisco describes the use of a threshold manager that sets thresholds and retrieves event information. However, it does not teach or suggest the use of an active query to send a notification from a configuration database storing threshold expressions within a network device

to applications executing on that network device upon occurrence of changes in those threshold expressions.

The term "active query" as used generally in the art, and specifically in this application, refers to generating updates upon occurrence of changes in one or more records of a database. To further elucidate this point, claim 1 is amended to recite that *an active query is established to send a notification to the application upon occurrence of a change in the threshold expression.*

Nowhere does Cisco teach or suggest the use of active query in any capacity. While the Examiner asserts that the use of active query in Cisco would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, he does not provide any reference to support this assertion. In this regard, Applicants note that utilizing Applicants' own invention as a blueprint to modify the teaching of a reference to arrive at the invention is not permissible.

Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-7, which depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1, distinguish patentably over Cisco.

Claim 8 recites a method of managing a telecommunications network. The method comprises displaying a threshold dialog box to a user, receiving a threshold expression from the user through the threshold dialog box, and implementing the threshold expression within a network device while the network device is operational. The step of implementing the threshold expression comprises establishing an active query between a configuration database within the network device and at least one application capable of executing a thresholding code, writing data from the threshold dialog box into at least one table in the configuration database, and updating the thresholding code with the data written into the at least one table in response to an active query notification from the configuration database to the application.

The arguments above apply with equal force to establish that claim 8 and claims 9-10, which depend on claim 8, also distinguish patentably over Cisco.

Further, the above arguments presented with respect to claim 1 apply with equal force to establish that claim 11, as amended, is also patentable over the cited reference. Similar to claim 1, claim 11 is amended to recite, among other steps, establishing at least one active query

between a configuration database and an application so as to send an active query notification from the database to the application when a new threshold expression is received – a feature not taught by Cisco as discussed above.

Claim 12 recites a method of managing a telecommunications network. The method comprises displaying a plurality of existing threshold expressions through a user interface, receiving a user selection of one of the existing threshold expressions, and implementing the selected existing threshold expression within a network device while the network device is operational. Implementing the threshold expression comprises the steps of storing the threshold expression in a configuration database, and establishing at least one active query between said configuration database and said network device so as to send a notification from the database to the network device upon occurrence of a change in said threshold expressions.

As noted above, Cisco does not teach or suggest establishing an active query between a configuration database and a network device so as to send notifications from the configuration database to the network device upon occurrence of changes in a threshold expression stored in that configuration database. Hence, Cisco does not teach at least one salient feature of claim 12.

Claim 13 recites a method of managing a telecommunications network that comprises executing at least one application on a network device and implementing a plurality of cascaded threshold expressions within that device. The implementing step comprises storing the cascaded threshold expressions in a configuration database, and establishing at least one active query between the configuration database and the application so as to send a notification to the application upon occurrence of a change in said cascaded threshold expressions.

Cisco does not teach or suggest cascaded threshold expressions. In particular, there is no mention in Cisco of one threshold expression causing the use of a subsequent threshold expression. Additionally, as stated above with regard to claim 1, Cisco does not teach the use of an active query. Hence, claim 13 distinguishes patentably over Cisco.

Claim 14 recites a method of managing a telecommunications network that comprises assigning a unique identifier to each of a plurality of resources in a network device and receiving a resource selection from a user through a user interface. Further, the method comprises

establishing a threshold evaluation for the selected resource using the unique identifier assigned to that resource.

Cisco does not teach assigning a unique identifier to a plurality of resources in a network device. Rather, Cisco teaches that, during the creation of a new threshold policy using the 'Create Threshold Policy' window, a profile name is entered by a user that is "customized" (See page 2-18 of Cisco), giving each threshold policy its own name. The unique identifier recited in claim 14 is, however, distinct from this policy name. Unlike the policy name, the identifier is assigned to a resource of a network device, allowing each resource to be checked against any threshold expression for increased system flexibilty (See page 280, beginning at line 4, of the specification).

Accordingly, claim 14 and claims 15-21, which depend either directly or indirectly on claim 14, distinguish patentably over Cisco.

The arguments presented above with respect to claim 1 apply with equal force to establish that claim 22 is also patentable over Cisco. Specifically, similar to claim 1, claim 22 is amended to include, among other steps, establishing an active query between at least one record of a configuration database within a network device and an application executing a thresholding code in that device – a feature not taught by Cisco. Thus, claim 22 is patentable over Cisco.

Accordingly, claim 22 and claims 23-25 and 28, which depend either directly or indirectly on claim 22, distinguish patentably over Cisco.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Paragraph 22, the Office Action rejects claim 9 as being obvious over Cisco in view of a Microsoft Corporation reference.

Claim 9 depends on claim 8, and hence incorporates the features of claim 8. As discussed above, Cisco fails to teach salient features of claim 8 and, consequently, those of claim 9.

Microsoft fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cisco. Microsoft is directed to a method for enhancing the security of SNMP communications through the use of community names and authentication traps to restrict communication of an SNMP agent to only a specific list of other SNMP management systems. It does not, however, teach establishing an active query between a configuration database within the network device and at least one application capable of executing a thresholding code. Nor does it teach updating the thresholding code with the data written into the at least one table in response to an active query notification from the configuration database to the application.

In Paragraph 24, the Office Action rejects claim 10 as being obvious over Cisco. Claim 10 is canceled without prejudice.

In Paragraph 26, the Office Action rejects claims 26 and 27 as being obvious over Cisco in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,977 of Fowler et al.

Claims 26 and 27 depend indirectly on claim 22, and hence incorporate the features of claim 22. As discussed above, Cisco fails to teach salient features of claim 22, and consequently, those of claims 26 and 27.

Fowler fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cisco. It is generally directed to a method of monitoring a system over a network utilizing sensors to detect system parameters. A processor monitors and processes those parameters to provide status information regarding the system and alarms when a certain parameter has exceeded a threshold value. But Fowler fails to teach the use of an active query as recited in claim 22. Thus, claims 26 and 27, which depend indirectly from claim 22, are patentable over the combination of Cisco and Fowler.

New Claims

New claims 32-34 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1, and hence incorporate its features. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 439-2514 if there are any remaining issues.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Reza Mollaaghababa
Registration No.: 43,810
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604
(617) 439-2000
(617) 310-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

1443293.1